and 20th October, 1986 in various telephone Exchanges in Delhi; and

(c) what action has been taken to check such obnoxious calls?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI SANTOSH MOHAN DEV): (a) Yes Sir. Such complaints have been received from time to time.

(b) Separate statistics in respect of obnoxious call complaints are not being maintained at present.

(c) On receipt of complaints, the line is connected to a suitable obnoxious call observation equipment and calling number traced.

Appropriate action is taken against the calling number under the Indian Telegraph Rules.

SHRI RAMSINGHBHAI PATALIA-YABHAI RATHVAKOLI: No, supplementary; Sir.

श्रीमती वीणा वर्मा : सभापति महोदय, मैं यह कहना चाहती हूं कि इस तरह की जो फोन कालज मिलती हैं तो उसकी वास्तविकता जानने के लिए मैंने एरिया मैनेजर को पत्र लिखा था। उसके जवाब में उन्होंने यह कहा कि इस तरह के जब वे फोनकाल आते हैं तो लंबे से लंबे समय 8–10 मिनट तक बात करें। जिससे कि कुछ पता लगाया जा सके। फिर भी यह पता लगाना मुश्किल है कि यह काल-ब्रोन कहां से आते हैं? तो ऐसी मनःस्थिति में और वी०आई० पी० लोगों को यह कहा जाता है कि लंबी से लंबी बात करें, लेकिन जब इस तरह के दहशत भरे काल-फोन आते हैं तो क्या यह संभव है कि वह 8–10 मिनट तक उसको जारी रख सकेगा या इंगेज रख सकेगा... **(व्यवधान)**...और यह कोई प्रेम-संवाद तो होता नहीं कि सुना जाय... **(व्यवधान)**.. फिर उनके जवाब में यह आता है कि इस तरह के फोन-काल को 8–10 मिनिट इंगेज रखा जाय... **(व्यवधान)**...

MR. CHAIRMAN: They want you to stand up to ten minutes of obnoxious calls.

SHRIMATI VEENA VERMA: I do not know how to engage such calls for ten minutes.

अच्छा, तो इस संबंध में मैं पूछना चाहती हूं कि क्या कोई सरकार के पास ऐसी योजना है, जिससे कि आधुनिकतम कोई मशीन लगायी जाय, जिससे जल्दी से जल्दी इस तरह के फोन-काल को ट्रेस किया जा सके ?

SHRI SANTOSH MOHAN DEV: Sir, from our department we cannot ensure that obnoxious calls should be for a longer period or a smaller period. It is for absolutely on the caller but it is a fact that unless it is for a longer period it becomes difficult to trace it out immediately. But in electronic exchanges we have introduced a device, whereby we can get the time of the call: the phone number and the duration and we are trying to take acion as per our Act and it is quite effective. I do not want to spell out the system because we do not want to disclose.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Mr. Chairman, Sir; I would like to know from the hon. Minister who falls in the category of V.I.P. and who falls in the category of V.V.I.P.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next question.

Erection of a TV tower on Ankai mountain in Maharashtra

*444. SHRI SHANKARRAO NARAYANRAO DESHMUKH: Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to erect a TV tower on Ankai mountain near manmad Railway station in Maharashtra; and

(b) whether a survey of the site was made last year and if so what is the result thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI AJIT PANJA): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

SHRI SHANKARRAO NARAYANRAO DESHMUKH: Sir, a survey was made last year and an answer was given to me through a letter that a survey was made. Therefore, I would like to know from the hon. Minister who conducted this survey, who collected the data and is there any correspondence going on between the State of Maharashtra and the Government of India.

SHRI AJIT PANJA: As I said, the quesion of survey did not arise, and there is no survey done so far as the region mentioned by the Hon. Member is concerned.

SHRI SHANKARRAO NARAYANRAO DESHMUKH: I have received answer in reply to my letter addressed to the previous Minister for Information & Broadcasting that a survey was made and it was not feasible. Is this true or not?

SHRI AJIT PANJA: As I said, Sir, a survey of Maharashtra coverage was of course made but the question was of the particular hill, Ankai; at the time when this survey was made region-wise and the time when this survey was made is during the Sixth Plan. At that time the parameters were that towns with one lakh and more population would be covered. But here the population mentioned, is 51,432 of the place mentioned, i.e. Ankai region. Therefore, it was not brought in.

डा० बापू कालदाते : सभापति महोदय, मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि जिस पत्र का आपने जिक्र किया है माननीय सदस्य ने, अब इस पत्र के बारे में आप जरा खोज कर सकेंगे क्या ? अगर खोज कर सकेंगे तो शायद उनके पत्र पर जवाब जो उनको मिला है, उसका आप ठीक से जवाब दे सकेंगे ।

Will you please try for that?

SHRI AJIT PANJA: If the letter is produced I will certainly look into it.

SHRI SHANKARRAO NARAYANRAO DESHMUKH: I will produce the letter, Sir.

Disparity in payment of bonus in the Corps of EME

*445. DR. H. P. SHARMA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that some civilian staff in the Corps of EME are being deprived of the benefits of productivity-linked bonus in comparison to their counter-parts in the same department;

(b) if so, what are the reasons therefor;

(c) what is the number of such staff who have been adversely affected;

(d) whether it is also a fact that the affected employees have been representing against this dual policy since 1979 but Government have not taken any decision in the matter so far; and

(e) if so, what steps Government propose to take to remove the disparity?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI ARUN SINGH): (a) to (d) In the Corps of EME 18,406 civilian employees, fulfilling the criteria laid down by the Government, have been receiving payment of Productivity Linked Bonus since the inception of the Scheme. 548 civilian employees of this Corps, involved in production, are not covered by the scheme, as *inter-alia* the units in which they are deployed have a majority of combatant personnel. The aforesaid 548 civilian employees have been receiving ad-hoc bonus since 1982-83.

(e) The matter is under the consideration of the Government.

DR. H. P. SHARMA: Mr. Chairman, quite a few problems arise in institutions where combatants and civilians both are doing the same kind of work, because same emoluments are not given to both categories of workers. The reply admits that there are 548 employees which are not covered by productivity-linked bonus. May I know the reason why they are being given only ad hoc bonus and they are being differentiated from other employees?